



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/534,880 03/24/00 NELSON

S NORTH-391A/A

WM02/0921

TERRY J ANDERSON ESQ
NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION
1840 CENTURY PARK EAST
LOS ANGELES CA 90067-2199

EXAMINER

SEDIGHIAN, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2633

DATE MAILED:

09/21/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/534,880

Applicant(s)

NELSON ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad R Sedighian

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2633

1. The specification is objected because of the following informality:
 - a) The reference numeral "74", in line 24 of page 10, should change to ---76 ---.

2. Claim 6 is objected because of the following informality:

- a) The word "first", in line 24 of the claim 6, should change to ---second ---.

Correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rostoker et al. (US Patent No: 5,729,535).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Rostoker discloses a shock-resistant system (1, fig. 2) for operatively interconnecting modules within a computer system (2, 5, 6, 9, fig. 2) to enable data to be transmitted and received therebetween (col. 4, lines 25-48), comprising: a first module (28, fig. 3) having one tri-stateable digital transmitter (col. 7, lines 66-67, col. 8, lines 1-14 and 18, figs. 3, 5) and one digital receiver (20, figs. 3, 5); and a second module (24, fig. 3) having one tri-stateable digital transmitter (col. 5, lines 62-63) and one digital receiver (col. 8, lines 65-67), and wherein the data transmitted and received by the modules substantially conforming to a standardized infrared communications scheme protocol (col. 2, lines 27-30, 38-42, col. 3, lines 1-30, 45-55, col. 4, lines 49-55, 59-67, col. 5, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Rostoker discloses the first and second modules are housed within an enclosure (col. 4, lines 25-30, 45-48 and 1, 9, fig. 2).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Rostoker discloses the first and second modules are operative to run an embedded application (col. 4, lines 25-30, 35-40, 45-50).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker et al. (US Patent No: 5,729,535) in view of Rautiola et al. (US Patent No: 5,991,639).

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Rostoker differs from the claimed invention in that Rostoker does not specifically disclose a standardized infrared communications scheme protocol, developed by the Infrared Data Association. Rautiola, from the same field of endeavor, discloses a mobile station (10, fig. 3A) having a transmitter (26, fig. 3A), a receiver (28, fig. 3A), and signal processing circuitries (20, 21, 22, fig. 3A) for RF signal transmission (col. 5, lines 64-67, col. 6, lines 1-6). Rautiola further discloses the mobile station (10, fig. 3A) can be connected to a terminal device (40, fig. 3A), through the use of a wireless transfer media (52, fig. 3A), and a data transfer protocol defined by IrDA (col. 8, lines 29-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a data transfer protocol defined by IrDA such as the one of Rautiola for the data transfer protocol of Rostoker in order to provide a common and suitable link service access point between the

computer and a base station for a further link to a network controller, when using a distribution facility such as fiber optic network in order to provide a point-to-point or one-to-multiple data link method of data transfer that is adapted to a broad range of computing and communication devices.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker et al. (US Patent No: 5,729,535) in view of Obradovich et al. (US Patent No: 6,148,261).

Regarding claim 5, Rostoker differs from the claimed invention in that Rostoker does not specifically disclose the system comprises a multiplicity of modules each having a transmitter and a receiver element formed thereon, and the modules being electrically interfaced to one another. Obradovich, from the same field of endeavor, discloses a personal communication system (fig. 2) to send and receive digital data (col. 2, lines 10-65), wherein a plurality of transceiver modules (29C, 29D, 29E, fig. 4) are interfaced to one another (col. 7, lines 64-67, col. 8, lines 1-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate transceiver modules that are interfaced to one another such as the one of Obradovich in the wireless communication system of Rostoker in order to provide a transmission system in which multiple requests can be retained, stored or resent, and digital information can be routed, processed, and transmitted via communication links between multiple points.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2633

Lang et al. (US Patent No: 4,785,465) is cited to show a first module (2, fig. 1) having a digital transmitter (col. 4, lines 58-63, col. 5, line 45 and 22, fig. 1) and a digital receiver (col. 5, line 47 and 21, fig. 1); and a second module (2a, fig. 1) having a digital transmitter (22a, fig. 1) and a digital receiver (21a, fig. 1), wherein the transmitters and receivers are electrically interfaced with each other (col. 7, lines 65 and A, B, fig. 1).

Cucci et al. (US Patent No: 5,528,409) is cited to show digital transceiver modules (col. 4, lines 17-34 and 14, 58, fig. 1) that are electrically interfaced with each other (56, fig. 1), and the data transmitted and received by the modules substantially conform to standardized infrared (20, 22, 50, 64, fig. 1) communication scheme protocol.

Stewart et al. (US Patent No: 5,267,070) is cited to show digital transceiver modules (col. 2, lines 50-68, col. 3, lines 1-2 and 14, 16, fig. 1) that are electrically interfaced with each other (17, fig. 1), and the data transmitted and received by the modules substantially conform to standardized infrared (32, 34, 38, fig. 1) communication scheme protocol.

Kekas et al. (US Patent No: 4,527,285) is cited to show a shock-resistant system (figs. 9, 10) for operatively interconnecting modules within a computer system (fig. 14) to enable data to be transmitted and received therebetween (col. 3, lines 9-30, 50-65, col. 4, lines 30-45).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad R Sedighian whose telephone number is (703) 308-9063. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (from 9 AM to 5 PM).

Art Unit: 2633

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703) 305-4729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 .

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600